

From: "Baran, Melinda K." <MELINDA.K.BARAN@saic.com>
To: "George Whitesides (E-mail)" <gwhitesides@gmwgroup.harvard.edu>,
"Joshua Lederberg (E-mail)" <jsl@j110.rockefeller.edu>
Subject: DSB/TRAC bio report
Date: Fri, 22 Jun 2001 15:08:54 -0400

Hello George and Josh--

1
Congratulations! You are *almost* done. I've made all of Dr. Skalka's changes except for the two below (in blue text). I wasn't sure what you wanted done re: those statements. Let me know what you prefer. I have only one substantive comment. It concerns to the next to last paragraph on page 97 where it is stated: "From the vantage of strategic defense, it may be desirable or necessary to hold this drug in reserve". I can conceive of no instance in which it would be ethical for our government to withhold a potentially life-saving drug from general distribution. Indeed, this point is clarified later, on p.105 (next to last paragraph). Nevertheless, I believe that the statement on p.97 should be changed or the ethical barriers to such a policy should be stated explicitly, lest someone be led to conclude that the DSB recommends such a course of action. Page 108, point 1. At page bottom. Should the statement read "It provided an unfavorable ..."? The context of that statement is the following:

"The international system of agreements, laws, and organizations bears on bioterrorism in a number of ways:

1. It provides a ^{favorable} ~~favorable~~ *in hospitable* environment for explicit state sponsorship, training, and sanctuaries, and for state acquiescence to terrorist activities. Of special concern are splinter groups with expired or deniable relationships to a state sponsor."

Once I hear back from you on these issues, I'll make the appropriate changes (if any), and take it to the DSB office. Again, congratulations--you're almost done!

Melinda

Melinda K. Baran SAIC--Weapons Proliferation Division Strategies Group (703) 676 6915